



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

What we need in the United States above all else, in order to establish perpetual peace with our neighbors, goodwill between all sections, justice between man and man, and a steady advance in prosperity of which all shall be partakers, is a system of just representation — a system which will give to each minority party, as well as to each majority, its due proportion in every legislative body, municipal, state and national. Had such existed before the Civil War, the union-loving people, both North and South, would have been represented in Congress much more largely, and the action of that body, guided by the light of reason instead of folly, would have written for this country another and a far brighter page in its history.

Certain persons, who give to strenuousness the highest place in the list of virtues, are prating of an irrepressible conflict between the Saxon and the Slav. In grandiloquent phrase, as though speaking ex-cathedra, they predict that either Russia, on the one hand, or an Anglo-Saxon alliance, on the other, is destined to rule the world, and that the present century will see one of these powers subjugated by the other. Such talk is worthy of consideration only because it tends to bring about the deplorable events it foretells. How much better and more rational to look forward to a federation of nations, a greater United States, not of the Americas alone, but of the whole world.

Let every brave man's death in this prison, let every monument here erected to his memory, be flagstones paving the way to universal peace.

And may that road be short.

Civilization Not Advanced by Armies.

From a sermon by Rev. Leighton Parks, D. D., of Boston.

When the story is written — and it has not yet been written — of the awful suffering that has followed the advance of civilization in India, in Madagascar, in Java, in the Philippines and in China, our children's children will stand appalled and wonder how we could have done it, just as we wonder how our fathers could have suffered the delusion of the witches. We are not so far advanced as we think we are, and when I say "we" I mean the most favored nations.

Now some one will say: "This is the talk of a minister, and not of a man of practical affairs. If a man who knows the world were to deal with this subject, he would know that you cannot carry the blessings of civilization except — we will not say by cruelty — no, we will not say by manifest injustice — no, but you cannot carry the blessings of civilization except by force." Now you would repudiate force as applied to yourselves. Yes; but it is necessary, we are told, in carrying civilization to the backward nations. And the proof, so it is asserted — the proof is that all through history it has been the army that has carried civilization (such as it was), and if you took the armed force away from the state anarchy would result.

Now, in answer to that, I venture to ask you to consider, my friends, whether this be the true state of the case; for I am convinced, for one, that it is *not* the true state of the case; that we have been deceived by the historians; that the battles of the world have filled so

graphic a space in picture that our attention has been drawn to them as if *they* were the real cause of the advance of civilization, when I believe they were nothing of the sort.

Indeed, I would go farther, and I venture the assertion that these things have hindered more than they have helped. Now, do not misunderstand me; I believe that in the state, just as in the city, there must be a police force, and that order must be kept wherever a government exists. We will have no discussion about that. The point is this: Has civilization been advanced by the army? I say, No!

Then it is answered: "Well, such civilization as we have come, did it not, from the Roman Empire?" Yes, largely. "Well, the Roman Empire extended its borders by force of arms, did it not?" Yes. "Very well, then, is it not true that but for the force of arms of Rome we should not have the civilization in which we now rejoice?" And I answer, No; it's not true! For here, have you ever considered what countries Rome really conquered? They were, first, the Provinces of Italy; they were Spain and Gaul, the littoral of North Africa, a part of Egypt and a part of Asia Minor. That is all Rome ever conquered. Now where are those nations to-day? Are they in the van of civilization?

Now what did Rome try to conquer? She tried to conquer the Germans, and she never was able to penetrate the German forests and hold those people in subjection; and out of the German forests have come Germany, England and the United States. Captain Mahan has told us in one of his most interesting books that the Roman Empire held back the invasion of the barbarians for two hundred years, and gave an opportunity for the Goths to become Christianized before they flowed down into Italy. That is quite true; but what was the Roman Empire doing then? It was standing on the defensive; it had long ago given up any attempt to conquer these unconquerable people. The people who went into the German forests and converted your fathers and mine were the Arian missionaries who carried nothing with them but the Gospel, and but for those men you and I would never have received the civilization in which we rejoice. For had those barbarians that invaded Italy and trampled out the ancient civilization been un-Christianized, exactly the same effect would have followed as from the invasion of the Moslems; but inasmuch as they were Christianized they heard with respect the voice of bishop and priest and monk, and received submissively the laws and customs and thought of Rome. A Roman army invaded England, but when the pressure came upon the Empire those garrisons had to be recalled, and England reverted, and not one trace, beyond a Roman pavement here and there and a splendid road, was left of the Roman occupation. But when Augustine landed on the coast of Kent he brought Roman law, Roman custom, Roman civilization.

It is not true that we who are carrying civilization in the van of the onward march of humanity to-day have received it from the power of the arms of Rome. We have received it from men whom those arms were never able to conquer.

And I instance one more example, in modern history, which many here can still remember, and that is the opening of Japan. Instead of occupying Japan, we

treated her as if she were civilized (which she was not), and to-day she stands in the forefront. Does any man believe that if when Perry opened the ports of Japan, England (and I mention her because she is the one country that has best learned how to colonize) — does any one suppose that if England had been asked to take possession of that island, Japan to-day would be the ally of England? No. We carried to those people the best, and we appealed to the highest motive, and see the result.

Now, brethren, I will not dwell upon it, but I do ask you, because you form public opinion, because the future is dependent upon you, not to attribute evil motives to those whose methods you do not approve of, but believe that the Anglo-Saxon race is to-day actuated by the highest and the noblest motives. But remember that it is possible for us, as for the Son of God, to be tempted to throw ourselves into hell.

A Retrogression in Civilization.

The following passage is taken from an address delivered at the recent annual meeting of the British Peace Society by Rev. John Hunter, D.D., one of the most eminent Nonconformist preachers of London :

"The day of war, alas, is not past, but morally it is an anachronism and retrogression in civilization. It ought not to be necessary now between civilized and Christian nations. It is a method and device of a barbarous period of social progress, and wherever practised, by modern nations, in some period of critical strain, it ought to be regarded like capital punishment as a horrible and tragical thing, not to be welcomed, not to be rejoiced at, but to be lamented, as a crime against humanity and a sin against God. For how it reverses all the natural and moral relations of men, and it decides nothing as to the right or wrong of the questions at issue — only which is the stronger of two military forces. A mere physical conquest can confer no moral right. Might cannot be right [applause], and the successes brought by violation of, or compromises with, moral law, are the most dangerous successes that can be won by men or nations. The true strength of nations rests in their allegiance to the highest ideal, and law, which they see and know. This, which is the teaching of religion, is the verdict of history. There never was a bolder and braver prediction than the third beatitude, "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." Though the word "meek" has been spoiled for us by its association with weakness and want of spirit, yet we know well what it meant. Jesus meant that the coming race would not be a coarse and brutal and arrogant people, but a race strong in all the higher qualities, strong in justice, strong in truth, strong in love and sympathy and self-sacrifice and religion; chivalrous, gentle, friendly, brotherly people. It is a bold prophecy, I say; but to an extent which few realize, it has become true, and will become more and more true as years and days go by. The progress of civilization so far has actually consisted in the gradual ascendancy in communities of the higher human qualities and of the unselfish virtues. And all noble development is in this direction, in leaving behind us our animalism, brutalism and barbarism, and all the methods and ways

born of them. In the lower and ruder stages of life, the survival of the fittest seems a merciless law, but by and by it takes on a new expression; it takes the weak under its protection, by summoning to their aid those human sympathies which render it necessary for the strong to help and defend the weak, if they themselves would come off conquerors in the struggle and vindicate their own fitness to live. Let us not turn our faces away, then, from the possibility of universal peace. Let us keep the ideal of Christian civilization steadily before us — the nations of the world bound in the bonds of brotherhood. We are no longer at the brutal and barbarous stage of social evolution; and it is no longer right to think and speak about war as men used in less enlightened times, praising and glorifying, as did Tennyson in "Maud," that worthless and, even then, antiquated barbarism — the Crimean war — because it broke in upon a state of things at home that was full of wrong and shame. If war is to be encouraged on the ground that without it the noble passions and heroic virtues grow cold and die, why do we not return to the savage state when every man was a fighter? But "Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war"; and the manly and heroic qualities need have no difficulty in finding, as they have found, other fields for their exercise and display than the battlefield. Think of the great moral and social reforms which were carried forward during the reign of Queen Victoria without shedding a drop of blood. Let us do the fullest justice to the courage that is shown in battle, but let us also remember the courage, the moral and Christian courage that is shown in the service of truth and charity. It is time that war was seen in its true colors, stripped of the trappings with which it is usually adorned. No matter how righteous or unavoidable it may seem to be, its actual facts are ever unspeakably horrible, its methods brutal and morally vulgar. Few of us have imagination enough to realize the enormous costliness of the war-system as it is in Europe, even in times of peace. All that is annually spent on libraries, art galleries, and on public education is more than swallowed up by a few days of war. That is part of the cost which civilization pays to barbarism. And to all this we have to add the diversion of the mental and moral energies of a people from the ennobling arts of peace with all their fruits.

New Books.

THE INFLUENCE OF EMERSON. By Edwin D. Mead. Boston: The American Unitarian Association. 304 pages. Price, \$1.20 net.

Students of Emerson, this, his centennial year, will find this book a most valuable aid in their studies. It blazes the way in the Emersonian forest and shows how to proceed in order to a just and adequate comprehension of the character and remarkable influence of Emerson on American literature, thought and religion. Mr. Mead has been a patient, painstaking, sympathetic, and even enthusiastic student and interpreter of the Concord thinker and philosopher for a full quarter of a century. The three chapters of this book, "The Philosophy of Emerson," "Emerson and Theodore Parker," and "Emerson and Carlyle," portray the salient features of Emer-